



**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF AUDITOR-CONTROLLER**

KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION
500 WEST TEMPLE STREET, ROOM 525
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012-3873
PHONE: (213) 974-8301 FAX: (213) 626-5427

WENDY L. WATANABE
AUDITOR-CONTROLLER

MARIA M. OMS
CHIEF DEPUTY

ASST. AUDITOR-CONTROLLERS

ROBERT A. DAVIS
JOHN NAIMO
JUDI E. THOMAS

December 22, 2010

TO: Audit Committee

FROM: Wendy L. Watanabe
Auditor-Controller

SUBJECT: **SUNSET REVIEW FOR THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY HIGHWAY
SAFETY COMMISSION**

RECOMMENDATION

The Audit Committee recommend to the Board of Supervisors (Board) to extend the Los Angeles County Highway Safety Commission's sunset review date to October 31, 2013.

BACKGROUND

The Highway Safety Commission (Commission) was created by the Board under Chapter 15.16 of the Los Angeles County Code. The Board approved the most recent sunset review extension in September 2004.

The Commission considers and investigates requests and suggestions related to traffic controls made by the Board, Commissioners, any officer, private person or groups of persons. The Commission submits reports and recommendations to the Board, and cooperates with other jurisdictions within Los Angeles County to:

- Eliminate and prevent major traffic problems.
- Develop uniform standards for street striping, curb painting, sign placement, reflectors, crosswalks and similar safety devices.
- Recommend speed regulations, traffic signals, and other traffic-control and regulation matters.
- Ensure maximum traffic safety.

The Commission has seven members, five appointed by the Board (one from each Supervisorial District) and two members nominated by the Board Chair from a list provided by private and parochial schools and the Los Angeles County Board of Education.

The Commission is required to meet quarterly or as needed. Commission members receive \$25 for each meeting attended, not to exceed four meetings per month. During the review period, two Commissioners waived their stipends. The Commission does not have a separate budget and the Department of Public Works (DPW) provides the Commission with staff support. DPW estimates that they paid approximately \$43,800 for Commission staff support and stipends during Fiscal Year 2008-09.

JUSTIFICATION

From April 2007 to December 2009, the Commission met 25 times, with an average attendance of 6 (86%) members.

The Commission serves as an appeals board for citizens who disagree with DPW's decisions regarding installation of traffic controls or modification of existing traffic regulations. During the evaluation period, the Commission heard 15 appeals of DPW traffic-control related decisions. Of these 15 appeals, the Commission denied nine and granted three. Two appeals were withdrawn and one appeal is pending the Commission's decision.

The Commission recommended traffic controls such as installation of road signs, crosswalks, turn signals and turn lanes. In addition, the Commission provided input on issues such as crossing guard services, traffic-related legislation, and the Safe Routes to School Grants, which make it easier and safer for children to walk or bicycle to school.

The Commission's objective for the coming period is to continue acting as an appeals board for citizens who disagree with DPW's traffic-related decisions. The Commission will also continue to provide input to DPW on issues such as crossing guard services, crosswalk removals, potential grants and legislation.

Please call me if you have any questions, or staff may contact Jim Schneiderman at (213) 253-0101.

WLW:MMO:JLS:TK

Attachments

- c: Robert A. Ringler, Chair, Highway Safety Commission
- Bill Winter, Assistant Deputy Director, DPW
- Irena Guilmette, Executive Officer, Highway Safety Commission
- Robin A. Guerrero, Chief, Board Operations
- Angie Montes, Acting Chief, Commission Services

COMMISSION SUNSET REVIEW
HIGHWAY SAFETY COMMISSION
REVIEW COMMENTS

Mission. (Does the mission statement agree with the Board of Supervisors' purpose and expectations?)

The stated mission is as set forth in the ordinance creating the Commission.
CONCUR.

Section 1. Relevance. (Is the mission still relevant and in agreement with the Board of Supervisors' purpose and expectations?)

The Commission acts as an appeals board for citizens who disagree with the decisions of the Department of Public Works (DPW) regarding installation of traffic controls or modification of existing traffic regulations.

The Commission's mission appears to be **RELEVANT.**

Section 2. Meetings and Attendance. (Are required meetings held and is attendance satisfactory?)

The Commission is required to meet quarterly or as needed. From April 2007 to December 2009, the Commission met 25 times, approximately nine times per year, with an average attendance of 6 (86%) members.

The Commission's meeting frequency and attendance is **SATISFACTORY.**

Sections 3 and 4. Accomplishments and Results. (Are listed accomplishments and results significant?)

During the evaluation period, the Commission heard 15 appeals of DPW traffic-control related decisions. Of these 15 appeals, the Commission denied nine and granted three. Two were withdrawn and one is pending the Commission's decision. In addition, the Commission recommended traffic controls such as installation of traffic road signs, crosswalks, turn signals and turn lanes.

The Commission's accomplishments and results are **SIGNIFICANT.**

Section 5. Objectives. (Are the objectives compatible with the mission and goals and relevant within the current County environment?)

The Commission will continue to act as an appeals board for citizens who disagree with DPW's traffic-related decisions. In addition, the Commission will continue to provide input to DPW on issues such as crossing guard services, crosswalk removals, potential grants and legislation.

The Commission's future objectives appear **RELEVANT**.

Section 6. Resources. (Are the resources utilized by the entity in support of the entity's activities warranted in terms of the accomplishments and results?)

Commission members receive \$25 per meeting, not to exceed four meetings per month. During the review period, two Commissioners waived their stipends. The Commission does not have a separate budget and DPW provides the Commission with staff support. DPW estimates that they paid approximately \$43,800 for Commission staff support and stipends in Fiscal Year 2008-09.

The Commission's expenses appear to be **WARRANTED**.

Section 7. Recommendation.

**EXTEND THE SUNSET REVIEW DATE FOR THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY
HIGHWAY SAFETY COMMISSION TO OCTOBER 31, 2013.**

Los Angeles County Highway Safety Commission Attendance Record

Commissioner	Nominated by:	6/30/07	9/30/07	12/31/07	3/31/08	6/30/08	9/30/08	12/31/08	3/31/09	6/30/09	9/30/09	12/31/09	Totals	% Attended
	Number of Meetings per Quarter													
Guillermo William Villalobos	1st District	2	2	2	2	3	1	3	3	3	2	2	25	
Rhett Samuel Price	2nd District	1	2	2	2	3	1	3	3	3	1	1	22	88%
Robert A. Ringler	3rd District	2	2	0	1	2	1	2	3	3	2	2	20	80%
John A. Spix	4th District	2	2	1	2	3	1	3	2	2	2	2	22	88%
Praful Kulkarni	4th District	2	2	2	2	3							11	100%
Vacant	4th District						1	1	3	1	1		7	58%
John F. Watkins	5th District	2	1	2	2	3	1	3	3	2	2	0	0	0%
Marvin W. Estey	BOS Chair	2	1	2	2	3	1	2	3	2	1	2	23	92%
Thurston T. Reese	BOS Chair	2	2	2	2	3	1	3	3	3	2	2	21	84%
		13	12	11	13	20	7	17	20	16	11	11	25	100%
Totals													151	
Average Attendance per Meeting													6.0	

Legend:

Vacancy was filled or Commissioner did not serve during this period.

